

REMARKS

Summary of the Office Action

In the Office Action, the Examiner recommends particular changes to pages 4, 5 and 14 of the specification at paragraph 1 on page 2 of the Office Action. The Examiner also recommends particular changes to Figs. 7A and 7B at paragraph 2 on page 2 of the Office Action. Also, the Examiner objects to claim 13 because it should allegedly be dependent on claim 7 instead of claim 1. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 11, 12 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,333,729 to Ha (hereinafter "Ha"). Claims 3, 6, 9, 10, 13 and 14 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Claims 16-19 are allowed.

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicants have amended claims 1 and 7 to differently describe the invention. Claim 13 is amended to correct a minor informality. The Specification has been amended at page 4, line 27, page 5, line 6, and page 14, line 20 in response to the Examiner's comments in the Office Action. However, instead of changing "DL7" to --DL-- at page 5, line 6, as suggested by the Examiner, "DL7" was changed to --DL5-- to accurately refer to the fifth data line. FIGS. 7A and 7B have been amended in accordance with the Examiner's comments in the Office Action. FIG. 2 has been amended to correct a minor typographical error.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(e)

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 11, 12 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Ha. To the extent that this rejection might still apply to the claims as newly-

amended, it is respectfully traversed as follows.

Each of independent claims 1 and 7 has been amended to recite that the method of driving a liquid crystal display includes supplying data to a desired number of data lines on a basis of a first sequence and supplying a data to a desired number of data lines on a basis of a second sequence, “wherein the second sequence differs from the first sequence.”

While Ha discloses a liquid crystal display apparatus that time-divisionally drives data lines of a pixel matrix, there is no teaching or suggesting in Ha of supplying data based on first and second sequences that differ from each other in the manner specifically recited in independent claim 1, as well as in the manner specifically recited in independent claim 7.

In particular, claim 1, as newly-amended, recites a driving method including “supplying said data to the desired number of data lines on a basis of a first sequence in a first horizontal period; and supplying said data to the desired number of data lines on a basis of a second sequence in a second horizontal period following the first horizontal period, wherein the second sequence differs from the first sequence.”

Moreover, claim 7, as newly-amended, recites a driving method including “supplying said data to the desired number of data lines on a basis of a first sequence in the $(4i+1)$ th and $(4i+4)$ th frames (wherein i is an integer); and supplying said data to the desired number of data lines on a basis of a second sequence in the $(4i+2)$ th and $(4i+3)$ th frames, wherein the second sequence differs from the first sequence.”

Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) should be withdrawn because Ha does not teach or suggest each feature of independent claims 1 and 7, as amended. As pointed out in MPEP § 2131, “[t]o anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim.” Thus, “[a] claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set

forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. Of California, 2 USPQ 2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987)." Furthermore, Applicants respectfully assert that dependent claims 2-6 and 8-15 are allowable at least because of their dependence from independent claims 1 and 7, as amended, respectively, and the reasons set forth above. Moreover, the Examiner is thanked for the indication that 3, 6, 9, 10, 13 and 14, while objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Further, with regard to the objection of claim 13 at Section 3 of page 2 of the Office Action, the dependency of claim 13 has been changed to be dependent on claim 7, as recommended by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that all outstanding objections to the claims be withdrawn for at least the foregoing reasons. Moreover, the Examiner is thanked for the indication that claims 16-19 are allowed.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

EXCEPT for issue fees payable under 37 C.F.R. § 1.18, the Commissioner is hereby authorized by this paper to charge any additional fees during the entire pendency of this application including fees due under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17 which may be required,

including any required extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account 50-0310. This paragraph is intended to be a **CONSTRUCTIVE PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME** in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(3).

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

Dated: September 22, 2003

By:



Paul A. Fournier
Reg. No. 41,023

CUSTOMER NO. 009629
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
Tel: 202-739-3000
Fax: 202-739-3001